



Docket No.: 239434US8

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313



ATTORNEYS AT LAW

RE: Application Serial No.: 10/608,031  
Applicants: Fumio TAKAHASHI, et al.  
Filing Date: June 30, 2003  
For: OPTICAL FIBER FOR WDM SYSTEM AND  
MANUFACTURING METHOD THEREOF  
Group Art Unit: 2874  
Examiner: STEIN, J.D.

SIR:


Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

We have not included a check as we do not believe any fee is required. In the event there are any Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Bradley D. Lytle


Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number

**22850**

(703) 413-3000 (phone)  
(703) 413-2220 (fax)

DOCKET NO: 239434US8



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF :  
FUMIO TAKAHASHI, ET AL. : EXAMINER: STEIN, J.D.  
SERIAL NO: 10/608,031 :  
FILED: JUNE 30, 2003 : GROUP ART UNIT: 2874  
FOR: OPTICAL FIBER FOR WDM :  
SYSTEM AND MANUFACTURING  
METHOD THEREOF

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the Restriction Requirement stated in the Official Action dated March 22, 2005, Applicants in the above-identified patent application provisionally elect Group I, Claims 1-10, drawn to an optical fiber with various transmission loss and dispersion properties.

The Restriction Requirement asserts that the application contains claims to distinct inventions. However, MPEP §803 states the following:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.

The claims of the present invention would appear to be of an overlapping search area. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully **traverse** the Restriction Requirement on the grounds that a search and examination of the entire application would not place a *serious* burden on the Examiner.

However, if the present Restriction Requirement is not withdrawn, examination on the merits of the Claims of Group I is believed to be in order, and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Bradley D. Lytle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

DOCUMENT12